

Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 677, Alison J. Nathan, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Brian Schatz, Jack Reed, Angus S. King, Jr., Elizabeth Warren, Chris Van Hollen, Raphael G. Warnock, Jacky Rosen, Tim Kaine, Patty Murray, Margaret Wood Hassan, Tammy Duckworth, Alex Padilla, Tammy Baldwin, Mazie Hirono, Christopher A. Coons, Patrick J. Leahy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Alison J. Nathan, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 96 Leg.]

#### YEAS—51

Baldwin	Hassan	Padilla
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Rosen
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Cantwell	Kelly	Schatz
Cardin	Kennedy	Schumer
Carper	King	Sinema
Casey	Klobuchar	Smith
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Lujan	Tester
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warnock
Feinstein	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Whitehouse
Graham	Ossoff	Wyden

#### NAYS—44

Barrasso	Grassley	Portman
Blackburn	Hagerty	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Lummis	Thune
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	

#### NOT VOTING—5

Burr	Scott (SC)	Tillis
Manchin	Shaheen	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VAN HOLLEN). On this vote, the yeas are 51 the nays 44.

The motion is agreed to.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session. The Senator from Illinois.

#### SENATOR PAUL SIMON WATER FOR THE WORLD ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was fortunate early in my political life to meet several people who became my heroes and mentors and led me to take up public service as my life's calling.

The first was a Senator from Illinois named Paul Douglas, and I met him when I was a college intern in his office. And he introduced me to a man named Paul Simon; Simon, who was a Lieutenant Governor in our State, State legislator, Congressman, and, ultimately, the Senator who preceded me in this Senate seat.

After Paul Simon passed away, I approached his family and talked about a tribute to him, and they basically said: Well, you remember Paul. He would have been the last person in the world who ever wanted a statue and really didn't care much about having anything with his name on it. That just wasn't his approach to politics.

But I thought to myself there were some things that he valued that maybe I can try to help in my own way in his memory. And one of them was in 2014, when I introduced a bill called the Paul Simon Water for the World Act.

Simon had written a book that didn't make the New York Times best seller list. It was entitled "Tapped Out." He had a theory many years ago that the issue with the 21st century was going to be water. And he made a pretty convincing case, and, frankly, the events and evidence since then have backed him up.

So this bill, the Paul Simon Water for the World Act, was designed to build on the success of an earlier effort called Paul Simon's Water for the Poor, which had passed 10 years before and sought to bring clean water and sanitation programs to the world's poorest communities.

Today, as we mark World Water Day, I want to recognize what we have accomplished with these two pieces of legislation. They have helped provide, for the first time, access to clean drinking water and sanitation for more than 60 million additional people around the globe.

Those successes have also improved global health, economic development, and educational attainment. And they have proven how far just a little Federal funding invested in the right area can go.

Both of those laws were passed on a bipartisan basis, and in recognizing the compounding benefits of clean water and sanitation, Congress has sustained the programs.

My staff has traveled to countries like Kenya, Ghana, Senegal to see

these programs in action. They have shared stories and photos with me about schools and villages that, for the very first time, have access to clean, drinkable water.

In Ghana, for example, these laws have helped fund something called the Digni-Loo Program. It has provided rural villages with clean, sustainable toilets and helped eliminate water-borne diseases in entire districts of the country.

This World Water Day, I hope we can reaffirm our commitment in this Senate to supporting legislation in the name of my friend and mentor, the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act, that will help bring global health for years to come.

#### NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. President, in just a few days, America's eyes will turn to the Senate Judiciary Committee as we begin the process of considering Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson for her nomination to the Supreme Court.

It is going to be a historic moment on Monday as Judge Jackson appears before the Committee, and gaveling the hearing to order as chair of the committee will rank as one of the highest honors of my career in Congress.

Next week, the American people will have a chance to meet Judge Jackson, learn about her, her professional record, and her life experience. But, for now, let me briefly share a few things that have impressed me the most.

By now, I am sure, many have heard about her experience. Judge Jackson has clerked at every level of the Federal judiciary. Most lawyers would consider a clerkship in any court as an achievement that they could brag about for years. She served as a clerk at every level of the Federal judiciary, including the Supreme Court.

She served in many roles in the courtroom as a public defender, a lawyer in private practice, and a district and circuit court judge at the Federal level.

She was confirmed by the Senate unanimously to serve on the U.S. Sentencing Commission, and she would be the first Justice since Thurgood Marshall with considerable defense experience.

Her qualifications are exceptional. In every role she has held, she has earned a reputation for thoughtfulness, evenhandedness, and collegiality.

Just as impressive as Judge Jackson's record is her character and temperament—humble, personable. She has dedicated herself to making our legal system more understandable and more accessible for everyone who came into her courtroom.

Finally, of course, there is the perspective that Judge Jackson will bring to the High Court. Over the course of its history, 115 Justices have served on the Supreme Court. If she is confirmed, Judge Jackson will be the 116th, but she would be the first Supreme Court Justice who is the daughter of parents who felt the crushing oppression of segregation and the first Justice who has

represented an indigent as a public defender.

Judge Jackson comes from a law enforcement family and has a deep appreciation for the risk of police officers, like her brother and uncles. And I believe one served in the Baltimore Police Department.

Indeed, with Judge Jackson's confirmation, the Supreme Court would come closer to fully reflecting the diversity of America.

When Justice Breyer announced his retirement, I promised that the process for confirming his successor would be fair and timely. Well, it has been. For instance, the committee sent a bipartisan committee questionnaire to Judge Jackson. In response she provided materials which shed considerable light on her record, her accomplishments, her writings, and her legal reasoning. Notably, this included more than 12,000 pages of public records from Judge Jackson's time on the Sentencing Commission.

The committee also sent a bipartisan document request to the Obama Presidential Library. That request sought documents relating to Judge Jackson's nomination to both the Sentencing Commission and the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. In response to that request, the Obama Library produced more than 70,000 pages of material.

Additionally, Judge Jackson has written hundreds of opinions—almost 600 now—which provide extensive insight into her legal philosophy.

In short, the committee has all the information it needs to evaluate Judge Jackson's qualifications to sit on the Supreme Court.

We have sent a lot of followup requests for information, too, and she has always responded in a timely way.

So we are going to proceed with her hearing come Monday. This process will provide committee members an opportunity to question Judge Jackson to learn more about her approach to judicial decision making, her views on precedent, and her record on and off the bench.

Here is how the hearing is going to work. Each member of the committee will be allocated 10 minutes to make opening statements. Each member will have a total of 50 minutes to question Judge Jackson. There are 22 members on the committee. If you do the math, there is plenty of opportunity for questions to be asked and answered. I expect it to be a substantive hearing. I expect members on both sides of the aisle to ask tough but fair questions and to give her an appropriate time to respond, and I expect that the committee will diligently perform our role in the Senate's advice and consent function.

When the hearing is complete, I believe the American public will be keenly aware of just what an outstanding nominee Judge Jackson is. I will also get to see what I have seen in meeting with her personally. She is thoughtful,

brilliant, kind, and has a good sense of humor.

She has already inspired young people across the country—young people who are just beginning to discover their passion for law. You see, she graduated from Miami's Palmetto Senior High School, a public high school in Pinecrest, FL. Right now, the halls of Palmetto High are buzzing with pride in anticipation for next week's hearing.

One school administrator told my office that, even though students will be out on spring break next week during beach season in Florida, many will be coming together for a virtual watch party as Judge Jackson appears before our committee. The administrator said that many of these students see themselves in Judge Jackson, particularly the members of the speech and debate team, which Judge Jackson was once a member of herself. In fact, Judge Jackson has cited her time on the speech and debate team as one of the most formative experiences of her life. She described it as "the one activity that best prepared me for future success."

Well, today, Judge Jackson is more prepared than perhaps anyone to serve on the Supreme Court. So to all the students at Palmetto High who are following in her footsteps, working long hours to hone their rhetorical skills, you are on the right track. While Judge Jackson may be the first Palmetto Panther to serve on the Supreme Court, there is no reason she should be the last. Years from now, who knows, maybe one of you will be preparing for your hearing before the Senate committee. Until then, you should all be so proud of Judge Jackson.

I would like to add another element to this—a personal element. When I spoke to Judge Jackson about her family, she was naturally proud of her husband, who is a surgeon, but she talked about her two daughters and showed me pictures of them. They are teenagers and obviously good kids. She is so proud of them. She told the story that when there was a vacancy announced on the Supreme Court several years ago, one of her daughters picked up a pen and wrote a personal letter to President Obama and said: Why don't you pick my mom?

It is that kind of support every parent lives for, and I am sure it means a lot to her. She is a good person, a good mother, a good parent, and she will be a great member of the Supreme Court.

I also want to say that there are elements that obviously the public has paid attention to. This being the fourth time before the Senate Judiciary Committee, many people in America know Judge Jackson or they have heard about her or they have read about her. They believe in a positive way that she will bring diversity to the Court; that she has the experience that is necessary to serve effectively; that she will uphold our constitutional values of liberty, equality, and justice; and that she will protect the constitutional rights of everybody, not just the

wealthy and powerful. She has ethics and integrity, and she will place justice before politics.

I am looking forward to this hearing. I am happy that the Republicans have said publicly that they want to make it a respectful hearing, and I certainly hope they live up to it. I will do everything I can to convince the Democratic side to aspire to the same goal. This can be a historic moment for America in the selection of this Justice. I hope the Senate Judiciary Committee rises to the occasion, and I have confidence that it will.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

NOMINATIONS OF CRISTINA SILVA AND ANNE TRAUM

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the nominations of Judge Cristina Silva and Professor Anne Traum, nominees to serve on the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada. Both nominees have built tremendous careers and legal reputations, and, last night, cloture was invoked on both of these nominees with strong bipartisan support.

Judge Silva has spent the bulk of her career as a Federal prosecutor in the city of Las Vegas, where she served as chief of the criminal division. In this role, Judge Silva oversaw all criminal investigations and prosecutions in the Nevada U.S. Attorney's Office. She has gained vast experience dealing with Federal criminal trials, including violent criminal cases, civil rights violations, and cyber crime.

Since 2019, Judge Silva has served with distinction as a Nevada State court judge, where she has earned the respect and admiration of her colleagues, as well as those who have appeared before her in court. Colleagues have called her "intellectually gifted and extremely hard-working" and have commended her "deep commitment to the rule of law."

These are exactly the kinds of qualities we need in someone nominated to serve on the Federal Bench, and they are the qualities that Judge Silva exemplifies. I know she will serve with independence and integrity.

For her part, Professor Anne Traum has also developed a distinguished legal career, one rich with examples of her commitment to the law and to public service. She has litigated civil cases with the U.S. Attorney's office, served as a Department of Justice trial attorney, and has worked for years on criminal cases as a Federal public defender.

Since 2008, Professor Traum has dedicated her career to helping shape the minds of Nevada's future lawyers as a professor at the University of Nevada Las Vegas's Boyd School of Law.

A deeply admired teacher, Professor Traum has gone above and beyond, founding a clinic to provide legal services to parties in Las Vegas who lack resources and volunteering significant time to pro bono programs in Southern Nevada. Professor Anne Traum has

worked to ensure that all individuals have adequate representation to defend their rights and that all individuals have access to our justice system.

And there is no better way to judge a professor than by the opinion of her students. In Professor Traum's case, her students regularly credit her courses as the most important courses in their legal careers.

The bipartisan judicial selection committee that Senator CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO and I put together fully vetted both of these nominees, and we both worked hand in hand with the White House to ensure that they were chosen for their exemplary qualifications, intellect, and passion for the law.

I was glad to see that both Professor Traum's and Judge Silva's nominations received bipartisan support—both as they advanced through the Senate Judiciary Committee and during last night's cloture vote. These highly qualified nominees for the U.S. district court are fully deserving of your support now, and I urge each of my colleagues to vote for their confirmation next week.

Nevada's Federal district court has been under enormous strain, with delays driving up the costs to businesses and individuals pursuing their claims in court. Filling the vacancies with these nominees would ensure that Nevadans have fair and reasonable access to the Federal courts.

It is time to confirm these nominees, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of Judge Cristina Silva and Professor Anne Traum.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

#### PROXY WARS

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, one of the challenges we face in this era of great power competition is identifying unique threats before they escalate.

When it comes to Russia and Ukraine, these threats have come into full focus. Vladimir Putin took off his statesman costume and declared a war of choice on Ukraine. Last week, we received the first public allegations of his intent to unleash Syrian proxies on anyone still standing between his war machine and the territory he covets.

I am glad to hear more of my colleagues speaking up about the unique dangers of proxy wars. Last week, I laid out in detail how Putin has used proxies to install himself in countries that are leadership poor but resource rich.

We know that fighters from the Kremlin-backed Wagner Group have slaughtered their way through Africa and the Middle East on behalf of Putin's grand Soviet ambition. And now he is going to do the very same thing in Ukraine.

We have also seen Iran unleash proxies and State-sponsored terror organizations in Iraq, against American Armed Forces and against civilian populations in Lebanon, Yemen, and Gaza.

In their 2022 threat assessment, the intelligence community stated:

We assess that Iran will threaten U.S. persons directly and via proxy attacks, particularly in the Middle East.

This is a public statement. This is the Annual Threat Assessment. It is backed by years of evidence, proving that Iran has done this before and they are going to try to do it again.

President Biden should be doing everything in his power to keep this threat as far away from American citizens as he can—but no such luck. The impending nuclear deal he is trying to hand Tehran unlocks billions of dollars for Iranian banks, companies, and other entities that finance violence.

Where does the White House think that money will end up?

We know there is nothing Tehran loves more than a power vacuum. They have invested heavily in Hezbollah, the Houthis, and Hamas—all terrorist organizations hunkered down in some of the world's most unstable regions. Over the past decade, the Iranians have spent more than \$16 million on carefully targeted bloodshed. That is right—Iran alone, the largest state sponsor of terrorism.

The landscape is chaos, and, still, the Biden administration is pushing the world toward a sanctions relief scheme that would empower the Iranians to terrorize and subjugate even more people.

The regime in Tehran is a menace. This week, incoming CENTCOM commander, General Kurilla, said as much in his confirmation hearing when we asked him how sanctions relief would affect the Iranian influence.

I am quoting him:

[T]here is a risk with sanctions relief that Iran would use some of that money to support its proxies and terrorism in the region, and if it did, it could increase risk to our forces in the region.

In this week's CENTCOM posture review before the Armed Services Committee, outgoing commander, General McKenzie, acknowledged these concerns about sanctions relief, saying:

[T]here is a risk that they could use that money in ways that we would not want them to use that money.

That is right. We certainly don't want them to put one more penny toward these proxy wars, for good reasons.

First, proxies don't just parachute in and declare victory. They brutalize entire populations and use weapons that these hostile regimes wouldn't normally have access to.

Second, because proxies operate outside the law, the rogue regimes that hire them maintain plausible deniability.

Third, this plausible deniability creates a false sense of security that allows hostile governments to pull up a chair to the negotiating table and pretend to fit in with normal countries, all the while denying the United States access and placement.

We have a limited number of ways to deter hostile regimes from waging war

on the civilized world. The West failed the people of Ukraine in this regard, but it is not too late to change course.

Ronald Reagan once said:

[W]ar comes not when the forces of freedom are strong, but when they are weak. It is then that tyrants are tempted.

He believed in achieving peace through strength, and so do I.

It is pretty simple. If you don't stand up for yourself, you will get run over, and if you don't stand up for your friends, there may not be anyone left to help them when the wolves are actually at the door.

When I talk to Tennesseans about this, the one thing they want to know is why President Biden makes decisions that make this country more vulnerable and less safe. Whether through lifting sanctions on Iran, slow-walking sanctions on Russia, or keeping our economy entangled with China's, Biden has refused to lead. Forget doing what needs to be done; he won't even say what needs to be said. He is fearful. He is scared to anger the new Axis of Evil. He is scared to anger our more timid allies in Europe. He is scared to anger the radical left here at home.

Is there anything that he is not afraid of?

He is so weak-kneed in the face of adversity that he can't even bring himself to finish building the fence that would secure our southern border.

I want to focus on that border security for just a few minutes because, while Russia and Iran might dominate headlines, for Tennesseans, our wide-open southern border is a perfect example of what can happen when a President concedes national security to score points on his political rivals.

Border encounters were up 2 percent in February. That is almost 165,000 people trying to enter the country unnoticed; 76 percent of the people the Border Patrol caught were single adults; cocaine seizures increased 83 percent; meth, 97 percent; heroin, 173 percent.

We know for a fact that terrorists and members of international criminal organizations cross our border with impunity. Over the course of 3 days last December, the Border Patrol arrested a guerrilla member of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, four MS-13 gang members, and an 18th Street gang member—six—six—distinguished representatives from the most dangerous gangs in the entire world and they almost disappeared into the country undetected. Thank goodness for law enforcement because these are not ordinary criminals.

In January of 2021, the Department of Justice indicted the 14 most senior members of MS-13 on charges of conspiracy to support, finance, and commit acts of terrorism.

Is this the Biden doctrine—choosing vulnerability over security and annihilation through weakness?

Who exactly does the President intend to win over with this approach?

Ukraine will find no peace in the easing of diplomatic tensions on some

U.N. panel. Children in Africa won't have a future if we start writing checks to proxy fighters. The people of El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras won't be better off if we enable the drug dealers and sex traffickers who make a living exploiting their families. No matter where in the world you look, you can see the costs of Joe Biden's willful blindness to danger.

He has the tools he needs to protect the United States from these threats. Now, he needs to use them.

It is time to stop relying on foreign oil and make the country energy independent again: Finish the Keystone Pipeline. Do an Operation Warp Speed for energy. Allow oil and gas exploration on Federal land.

We have to stop leading from behind when it comes to preventing Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons.

President Biden must submit to Congress any deal with Iran; and rest assured, we will block the implementation of anything the White House tries to sneak under the radar. We must pay attention to the flow of money and power in proxy hotbeds and recognize the danger posed by these terrorists for hire. We can't neglect security threats close to home. It is time to secure the border and give our law enforcement officials the resources they need to catch terrorists and gang members before they disappear into the country.

Tennesseans can't identify with the President's refusal to lead. They are confused and frightened, but they also have faith in our ability as a country to pull out of this skid. They believe in the promise of America. All they want is for their President and elected leaders to prove that they also believe in this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The Senator from Nebraska.

#### UKRAINE

Mr. SASSE. Madam President, I want to talk about three things.

First, Ukraine.

What do they need? How much aid? What kind, and how urgently can and should we get it to them?

Second, omnis.

Does the way the Congress spends money make any sense right now?

And, third, political grandstanding.

In particular, can politicians resist the short-term political crack that is social media?

First, Ukraine.

How much aid do they need? What kind and how urgently? The answer is they need everything, and they need it yesterday.

If they can shoot it, we should ship it. Ukrainians are fighting for freedom, and we should be doing more to help: Javelins, Stingers, lethal drones like Switchblades, surface-to-air missiles like the S-300s, coastal defense missiles, machine guns, ammo, grenade launchers, night vision goggles, and, yes, planes—more and more of them faster.

I applaud the President for some of what he has done, for sending some of this, but I would also note that there are really important weapons that are not yet in Ukrainian hands, like the S-300s.

I would also note that it takes time to cross the border, and we should be sending this stuff as fast as possible, not having the administration's lawyers debate how many angels can dance on the tip of a SAM or debate which weapons should be considered offensive versus defensive.

Look, the Ukrainians are the people who are being victimized; they are the people who have been invaded. Every weapon we give them right now is a defensive weapon. It is Russia that has invaded Ukraine, and these lawyerly distinctions don't really make a bit of difference to a Russian invading pilot. If he gets shot down, which weapons system it came from is not really the concern he is going to have at that moment.

So the answer to the question "What kind of aid does Ukraine need?" is more and faster.

Second, omnis.

Does the way the Congress works right now—does the way that we manage the power of the purse, does the way the appropriations process works—make any sense?

Can any of us go home and explain it to our constituents as the cautious, careful, prudent, adult management of the FISC? Obviously not. This process doesn't work.

I am 50 years old, and in the last 46 years—I think the current number is four times in the last 46 years that the Congress has spent at least 30 percent of its money under regular order on a regular appropriations process—four times in 46 years. This doesn't make sense. It is not prudent. It doesn't work.

For weeks, I have been calling on the President and his administration to submit an emergency supplemental to Congress so we can send Ukraine all of the aid they need faster.

Look, I am a fiscal hawk, but I am also a defense hawk, a security hawk, and I am A-OK with our spending a bunch of money fighting for the defense of freedom as long as the Ukrainians have fight in them. They are fighting not just for their kids and their future; they are fighting for free peoples. Putin will not be stopped until someone stops him. So the Ukrainians are doing a service to us—they are willing to fight. We should be willing to fund and to resupply them.

The reality is that my calls for an emergency supplemental were ignored. The administration didn't make any emergency supplemental request. The Congress's hands are not guilt-free either. We didn't even vote on an aid package for the Ukrainians until more than 2 weeks after the invasion.

Why the wait?

Washington did what it always does and decided it would just add the de-

fense money to the orgy of spending and pet projects and bureaucracy—that we spend every year—in the middle of the night in a thousands-and-thousands-paged bill that not a single Member who voted on it here had actually read.

So what did we do with the Ukrainian aid?

The reality is there was some important aid in the omni, but we should talk about how much it was. We spent \$13 billion on Ukrainian aid out of a total appropriations package of \$1.5 trillion. For those of you doing math at home, that is less than 1 percent of what we passed in the middle of the night last week that was actually Ukrainian aid.

Here is a depiction: This is the aid bill, and this tiny, little subpiece of 1 percent is the portion that was Ukrainian aid.

The reality is that the bill we voted on last week wasn't really about Ukrainian aid. Ukrainian aid was a little bit of sugar on the larger medicine of a \$1.5 trillion bill that nobody would actually want to go home and defend to the voters and to the taxpayers of America was well thought out.

So why does this happen?

Well, the American people aren't stupid. A lot of politicians think voters are stupid. They think you can jingle a shiny thing over here and then make up any claim you want, but the reality is voters aren't stupid. Voters are distracted, and they are busy, but they are not unaware of what is happening here.

They know why politicians talk like this—why they say that if you didn't vote for a \$1.5 trillion bill, you were against puppies; you were against food for children; and you were against all of these really great "mom and apple pie" kinds of things when the reality is you probably voted against the bill because there was a whole bunch of schlock in it that was unvetted, not because you said: Hey, I don't want the Ukrainian freedom fighters to have the military aid that they need. People talk like this so that they can bully the other side.

This is, quite frankly, a boring speech. It is not a speech that I want to be giving. But the truth is, if you allow liars to constantly lie, and they can get away with it, then they just keep doing it. So it is probably useful for us more often to take people's nonsense tweets, which they do for a bizarre audience of political weirdoes on Twitter, and they should have to defend these statements in public.

It is transparently obvious that if you vote against a \$1.5 trillion bill, that doesn't mean you were trying to vote against everything particularly in it; that you were against those kinds of funding. It might be because you were against lots of things in it that are indefensible before the voters. It is transparently stupid, and the voters get it.

So to the question of do omnis make sense? The answer is, no, we should do better.

But the question that our Republic is partly going to have to resolve if we are going to get healthy again as a polity is, Will politicians be able to resist the short-term crack of social media?

It doesn't look like very many of us in this body are interested in trying to speak to 70 and 75 and 80 percent of the electorate, but rather that lots and lots of politicians are completely happy to speak to the very narrow range of fan service that they do on Twitter.

Many politicians are addicted to Twitter. They want their sick burns and their retweets and their likes. It is crack and they have an addiction and it is sad.

The truth is that the folks who do this kind of garbage are hopelessly out of touch with the reality of the people's lives that we are actually supposed to be serving. It is not useful to drink your own bath water.

Twitter isn't real life, so it is probably useful for us to pause more often and try to make sure we have some common facts about the connection between political Twitter and reality.

First, only 20 percent of Americans are on Twitter—19 or 20 percent of Americans are on Twitter. Political Twitter is something like the ninth most watched portion of Twitter; sports Twitter, a foretaste of Heaven, unlike political Twitter, a foretaste of Hell. Sports Twitter is much bigger than political Twitter. Hollywood Twitter is bigger than political Twitter. K-pop Twitter is much, much bigger than political Twitter. So let's just start by recognizing that only 20 percent of Americans are on Twitter, and politics isn't a top five subportion of Twitter.

Of those who are on Twitter, only about 40 percent say they ever use Twitter for politics. But for the small minority of Americans who do pay attention to political Twitter—again, 40 percent of 20 percent—if you are doing math at home, we are now in single digits here. So 40 percent of 20 percent is 8 percent of Americans. For those who do pay attention to political Twitter, the political tweets are dominated by a very, very, very, very small share of American adults. Something like 80 percent of all tweets come from 10 percent of Twitter users. But this is the audience that politicians are playing for when they grandstand on Twitter.

Let's be clear, this happens all over the political continuum. This isn't chiefly on the right or chiefly on the left.

If you ever wonder why are politicians such weirdoes, it is mostly because they are grandstanding for a very, very narrow niche audience of weirdoes on Twitter, and so we should actually ask if it is healthy to continue doing that.

So to our core questions, the Ukrainians, do they need aid? Yes, they do. We should fund freedom fighters.

To the question of do omnis work? No, they don't, and everybody knows it.

But to the question of should we continue doing political discourse like this? Should we say that someone who had concerns about this was trying to kill off babies and puppies? No, we shouldn't lie like this. We shouldn't do that.

We owe the voters better than that. We should tell the truth, and we should try to talk to voters like you are actually talking to a room of regular people who have jobs and who are actually trying to put bread on the table for their kids and probably are pretty grateful for the inheritance that is the American Republic and our leadership on the global stage for freedom lovers.

The Ukrainians are that. We should fund the Ukrainians. We should have funded them in a more prudent way than an omni.

But if you voted for an omni when I voted against it, I am not going to attack you for voting for the omni. But don't go out there and lie and pretend that somebody who voted against the omni was against all the stuff in it, some of which is pretty decent.

We can do better. We should.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

#### REMEMBERING SONNY RUNDLELL

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I rise this afternoon here among my colleagues and those back home in Kansas to pay tribute to a Kansan, Sonny Rundell.

Sonny passed away this past Friday at the age of 89, and I want to take a moment to recognize his life and his service. A moment is insufficient, certainly, to pay the tribute that this gentleman and his family deserve.

Sonny was born in Pierceville, KS, a little town in Southwest Kansas. In places as rural as Pierceville, people are sparse, and so you quickly learn what is important. And Sonny learned that in his life, family, church, community were the important things.

Sonny embodied qualities that fostered his community: hard work and generosity. And like so many young men of his generation, he was called to service to his country. In 1953, he answered that call and left to serve in Korea.

When he returned home to Kansas in 1956, he finished his degree at Kansas State University, earning a degree in agriculture. He went on to farm land in Hamilton, Stanton, and Finney Counties for more than 30 years.

Sonny was involved in so many ways. He was a churchgoer, and he cared about education advocacy throughout our State. He was a member of the State board of education and was an advocate for education for all kids in our State.

He had preceded that by being a member of the Syracuse, KS, Board of Education, the High Plains Special Education Cooperative. He was a founding member of Garden City Community College Board of Trustees, a founding member of the Education Eq-

uity Advisory Council, the Education Commission of the States, the Kansas Commission on Teaching and America's Future, and the National Association of State Boards of Education, and that is only to name a few.

Sonny recognized, as I hope we all do, that education is the great equalizing opportunity for Americans, for Kansans. It allows us to pursue what we call the American dream.

He received lots of recognitions during his life. He received those for his advocacy, and in 2003 Sonny was awarded the Governor's Award for Distinguished Service to Secondary Education in Kansas.

From 2000 to 2003, our country recognized 50 years since the Korean war. And during this time, the Republic of Korea issued a service medal and awarded those to veterans who had served, coordinating with congressional offices like mine. I was pleased to be able to recognize Sonny's service to our Nation.

Particularly in these troubled times, these days in which we see the surge for support for freedom, Sonny committed to doing so and served his Nation and the world in that cause of freedom.

In 2002, while I was still a Member of the House of Representatives here in the Nation's Capitol, I was pleased to be able to honor Sonny for his recognition during the Korean war.

Then and now, I thank him for his dedication to our State, and I thank him for his service to our Nation.

My prayers are with his wife Verna and to his entire family and loved ones.

Robba joins me in expressing our sincere condolences and wish those who remain to look at the life of Sonny Rundell and recommit ourselves to service to our community, to our family, and to our church.

#### REMEMBERING DICK HEDGES

Madam President, this afternoon I rise to pay tribute to a Kansan, a champion of the Fort Scott community, Dick Hedges.

In Kansas, we talk often of community and how important it is to the fabric of small towns that dot the State.

There are small towns in Southwest Kansas, and there are small towns in Southeast Kansas because in Kansas, those communities matter so much. We grew up knowing our neighbors and making the effort to get involved with those around us that ensure our smalltown survival.

Dick Hedges was a man who took that need for a strong community to heart and helped build the fabric of Fort Scott in so, so many ways.

Last night, I was reading the Fort Scott Tribune, and I read an article in tribute to Dick. Its headline read: "Man who shared so much is remembered." It is a pretty good headline to have upon your death, "shared so much."

Dick was a coach, a teacher, a vice principal, a principal, a college president; he was a member of the community civic clubs and a churchgoer; he

served on local boards; he wrote for local papers; and he championed the arts in and around Fort Scott.

In 2018, he even opened a local book store because the community needed one. He was a man who shared so much of himself: his time, his love, his experience, his loyalty, and his commitment to others.

He was an advocate for athletics and sportsmanship and the way it could influence young students in a positive way. For 40 years, he shared his life with purpose and continually found new ways to do so.

But to Dick, I expect that was his definition of "community," sharing oneself for the betterment of others with the expectation that they, too—the people whom you help—may pay it forward.

Dick has impacted the lives of so many, so many throughout his life, and his life gives me hope for others like him in towns across Kansas and around the country.

My prayers are with his wife Jan, the Fort Scott community, and his entire family and loved ones.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

UKRAINE

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I got the chance to hear some of Senator SASSE's remarks. I noted the floor chart with my name on it, accusing me of what he called tribal hackery.

I am not exactly sure what the rules of the Senate are. I am not sure that that is becoming of the U.S. Senate to use those terms about fellow Members, but let me come down to the floor to explain why I think we should have a legitimate debate in this Chamber about a phenomenon in which Republicans very often are not willing to cast their vote in a way that is aligned with their voice.

Yes, I noted this morning—as was displayed on Senator SASSE's chart—that this week, of the Republicans who stood up at a press conference and eviscerated President Biden's handling of the Ukraine crisis, two-thirds of them voted against the budget that included \$14 billion of aid to Ukraine. I see a fundamental inconsistency in criticizing an administration for not doing enough but then not being willing to cast a vote to get aid to the people of Ukraine.

Senator SASSE's second chart—the one that didn't accuse me of tribal hackery—laid out a very true statement, in which a small percentage of the overall budget is dedicated to Ukraine aid. That is, of course, true.

But the reason why I find it concerning that Members of the Senate who, I take their word for it, are genuinely interested in getting help to the people of Ukraine are then voting against the budget that delivers it, is because it speaks to a broader problem in the Senate today, which is a lack of interest in compromise, a lack of interest in finding a result—a fealty to the perfect and an antagonism to the good.

Mr. SASSE. Would the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Sure, I would be happy to yield.

Senator SASSE, I was going to try to respond to your critique, but I am happy to yield at this point.

Mr. SASSE. So let me just see if I understand what you just said.

Eight-tenths of 1 percent of the bill that was passed in the middle of the night last week is about Ukraine aid. Do you believe that the people who voted against it voted against it because they were against Ukrainian aid?

Mr. MURPHY. So every one of us approaches a big—

Mr. SASSE. I am asking a really simple question: Do you think a single person that your Twitter self-pleasuring was for—do you think a single person that voted against it voted against it because they were against Ukrainian aid?

Mr. MURPHY. Absolutely not.

Mr. SASSE. So, then, what is the point of the tweet?

Mr. MURPHY. The point is that the only way that this place passes legislation is compromise, is voting on pieces of legislation that have in it things that—

Mr. SASSE. What are the pieces, dude? It is \$1.5 trillion.

Mr. MURPHY. Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I would ask the Senators to direct their questioning to the President and give the Senators the decorum to respond.

Mr. MURPHY. So inside every piece of legislation are elements that many of us disagree with, right? Inside that budget that you voted against are all sorts of things that I disagree with. But, in the end, in order to govern the country, you have to be able to find a path to compromise.

And what I have found, over the time that I have been here, is that there is a pathway to getting things done. It generally involves 90 to 100 percent of Democrats and a small slice of Republicans. It is increasingly hard to find compromise that involves more than 10 or 15 Republicans because, as you state, inside these pieces of legislation there are things to disagree with, right? There are things that you find objectionable.

So while, in the past, I think people would set aside some of the things that they weren't happy about in the interest of the greater good, today there seems to be a higher bar, and the result is that it is just a lot harder to get things done.

Now, on the budget, luckily there were enough of us that were willing to celebrate the good, as opposed to the perfect, in order to get that budget passed and significant aid to the Ukrainian people across the finish line.

My worry is that, as time goes on, there will be an inability to find those coalitions and that we will be stuck in a world in which you can't get Federal budgets done, you can't get big pieces of legislation done because there isn't that interest in compromise that is

necessary sometimes to get passed a big package like the one that we passed earlier this week.

Mr. SASSE. When you are willing, if I may.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, Senator SASSE.

Mr. SASSE. I think there are three topics. Argue with me if I misread the three topics before us.

One is Ukrainian aid. I don't think we differ. And the reason I came to make a speech—and you and I have talked about this offline multiple times in the past. Let me name the three: One, there is Ukrainian aid. Two, there is the budgeting and appropriations process. And, three, there is the grandstanding that happens for audiences that don't have anything to do with persuading a single human being that is called to work in this space.

In bucket one, I think you know that not a person who voted against it—the omni—voted against it because of the Ukrainian aid. So I think it is a dishonest argument.

In bucket two, which—well, I am jumping in and you have the floor; so I will give it back to you. But, in bucket two, you have repeatedly used the term "people won't vote for something because it is not perfect." I think that, if we could put the appropriations process of the U.S. Congress up to the American people for a referendum, the idea that you want to give it a B-plus or an A-minus, I submit you should take that to the voters of Connecticut and try to persuade them of that, because I am going to guess that, whatever the overall approval rating is of Congress, it bounces around between like 9 and 15 percent. My guess is, the way we spend money, it is lower than that. So I don't think you want to give yourself an 86 or a 92 or a 95 percent because it is not perfect. It is obviously an F. The way that we spend money here is not deliberative; it is not thought out. It is always thousands of pages that come out in the middle of the night, and it always votes.

So to your point, that you said budgets pass around here with 50 of 50 Democrats and 10 or 12 of 50 Republicans, that is true. We do have a philosophical difference about whether or not the appropriations process works.

I think you are the one voting on the side that is misaligned with both fiscal reality and the role of the American people. But I didn't come to beat you up about voting.

I am supposed to direct it to the President.

Madam President, I don't think the Senator from Connecticut is on the floor because I came to attack him for voting for the omni. I didn't. He misrepresented why some people who voted against the omni were dishonest by saying they were for more Ukrainian aid when there was Ukrainian aid in this budget.

But the real thing we are talking about is grandstanding, because there is not a person on Earth who is persuaded by that kind of tweet. You



didn't move anybody. You are doing fan service for a subset of people who like CHRIS MURPHY. I get why some people would like things that you stand for and advocate for. I get it.

But there is not a person who disagreed with you who is moved because of a tweet like that. There is not an uninformed American who became informed. But there is a subset of the people who already like you that you got to grandstand for. That is all that happened with that tweet. The Republic got dumber because of that tweet. Nobody learned anything.

Mr. MURPHY. Reclaiming my time. Listen, I understand that Republicans would love for this inconvenient truth not to be pointed out for them—right?—the fact that they are eviscerating the President at press conferences for the crisis in Ukraine. There were Members at that press conference that Senator SASSE attended that said, if not for President Biden, this invasion would have never happened; that it was his fault.

Mr. SASSE. Not my view.

Mr. MURPHY. That might not have come from Senator SASSE's mouth, but there were others at that press conference—right?—who have repeatedly blamed this entire crisis not on Vladimir Putin but on Joe Biden's policies. And I do think it is convenient for Republicans to consistently eviscerate the President for his conduct but then not be willing to cast the difficult votes necessary to help the President effectuate a policy there.

The consequence of a "no" vote on that budget, whether you like it or not, was that assistance money not getting to Ukraine. There wasn't another vote in front of us. The only choice that this Senate had was, Do we support a piece of legislation that includes necessary money—

Mr. SASSE. Will the gentleman yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is out of order.

Mr. MURPHY. I let the Senator finish.

The choice before this Senate was, Are we going to support a piece of legislation that includes the necessary money in order to allow for Ukraine to defend itself and for this administration to get emergency resources, or are we going to vote it down?

And I understand that the American public are rightly upset about the way in which we budget. But, on that day, there was one choice before this body.

So I do see that there is an inherent contradiction between Republicans standing up at press conferences, which, frankly, are speaking most often to the same audience that you believe that my tweets are speaking to, right? Most often, these press conferences are designed to rally the faithful.

So I think it is a bit sanctimonious to suggest that only one of us in this Chamber is involved in preaching to the choir. Much of the engagement in

press conferences here, around this issue of Ukraine, ends up speaking to base audiences, and the message being sent to that audience is that President Biden isn't doing enough.

And then, when we had an opportunity to pass bipartisan legislation to give him the tools to do more, the same Republicans that were at that press conference criticizing the President decided—and, I submit to you, for legitimate reasons having nothing to do with the Ukraine money—to cast a vote that had the consequence, if it was the majority position in this body, to disapprove of that money, to reject that money.

Mr. SASSE. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator yield his time—

Mr. MURPHY. I would.

Mr. SASSE. I would direct a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER.—for a question?

The Senator from Nebraska.

And I would ask both Senators to direct their remarks to the President, please.

Mr. SASSE. Madam President, I would ask the Senator from Connecticut to explain to me why the only choice was \$1.5 trillion or zero. The Senate could work its will and have passed the \$13.6 billion of aid money 10 minutes later.

Madam President, could the Senator from Connecticut explain to me this apparent—to me, false—choice between \$1.5 trillion and zero. Why were there no other options?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut wish to respond to the question?

Mr. MURPHY. I will. Thank you, Madam President.

The Senator is exactly right. Not only was there another option—pass the Ukraine supplemental on its own—there were a million other options. Right? There are always different ways that we can do things, and that is always a reason to vote no.

I could always choose to vote no on a measure before us because I can dream up of a scenario in which the outcome would be better aligned with my priorities. I think that is a very convenient reason to defend a "no" vote: that there is a theoretical outcome that would be more in alignment with your beliefs.

That is not how things work here, right? We are presented with pieces of legislation we all have input into. This was not a Democratic bill. This was a bill worked out with many Republicans as well. And ultimately we had a choice. We had a choice.

And, again, I think it is a lot easier to just come down here to vote no on everything. But when life and death are at stake in a place like Ukraine, I think, on the willingness to support a piece of legislation that maybe has some things in it you don't like, the bar may be a little bit higher.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield his time for a question?

Mr. MURPHY. I don't think I have anybody seeking to yield at this point.

Let me say this. I take Senator SASSE's position seriously, and I want him to take my position seriously, as well, because I object to the idea of my effort to draw attention to the fact that Republicans voted against a bill that includes significant money for Ukraine as political hackery. I object to that characterization because I do think I am speaking to a broader trend line in this body, in which it is seemingly harder than ever to get both sides to the table to agree to big things that change people's lives or change realities overseas.

I think Senator SASSE makes an important point, which is the way we are doing things right now with respect to the budget is insanity. I agree with that. The lack of transparency, the fact that all of this work is shopped to the majority and the minority leaders—that is not good for government; that is not good for transparency. I think there are legitimate reasons why Members of this body would vote against the budget.

But that is not what my statement was about. It was about trying to juxtapose that vote to this criticism of the President. I do think those two things are relevant because the American public is being given the impression by many Republicans that the President isn't being serious enough about this crisis or isn't working hard enough at this crisis.

And I do think it is legitimate to put on the table for a discussion the fact that the very people who are criticizing the President's conduct are often not willing to support the funding necessary for him to carry out that mission—for reasons that have nothing to do with Ukraine but have, in the end, the effect of denying the President, if this position was the majority—it was not last week—given that the consequence of voting down the budget would have been to ultimately deny that funding to the President and to the people of Ukraine.

I think this is a legitimate topic for discussion, and I will continue to raise it. I will take the Senator's word seriously and try to raise it in a way that is constructive, but I think this is a legitimate topic for discussion in the U.S. Senate.

This is not about rallying the base. This is about trying to promote a discussion about how we make this place more functional and how these press conferences that Republicans are doing end up having some connection to the reality of the votes that happen on the floor of the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SASSE. Madam President, in the interest of comity, I will underscore three points of agreement from Senator MURPHY's last few minutes there, as well, just as a way to close us out.

No. 1, I agree with the Senator that there is a lot of grandstanding all over

political theater right now, and that certainly includes people on my side of the aisle who have tried to imply that pieces of this are President Biden's fault; that the evildoer here is Vladimir Putin, who is targeting women and children; and Americans should be on the same team against that evil.

So to the degree that the Senator is partly motivated by frustration with some grandstanding that he has seen by people who have an "R" behind their name, I agree.

Second point: I am for this funding, and my criticism of the Biden administration has not been because they wouldn't support funding. In the intel space, there are a whole bunch of arguments and fights we have been having that we can't talk about in this setting but where I just want them to go faster.

But the idea that the problem with the administration, from my point of view, is an unwillingness to fund—that isn't my position, and so the Senator and I are united that that would be an unfair criticism of the Biden administration.

And third and finally, he called our budgeting and appropriations process "insanity." Let's put a pin in that because what I was voting against last week was not done for the purposes of saying the Ukrainian aid money shouldn't move, but it is saying that an insane budget process shouldn't work this way, where the American people can't get access into other monies being spent. And we have 12 or 13 subcommittees of the appropriations process, and we almost never get to vote bill by bill.

I would gladly have us stay here 24/7 for 2, 3, 4 weeks—however long it took. And if we had to cast not just 12 or 13 subcommittee approps packages, but if we had to vote on hundreds or thousands of things item by item—it is a pretty clunky process but a much better process than we have right now, which the Senator from Connecticut rightly described is "insane." On that we agree. Thank you for engaging.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). The Senator from Nevada.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 794, 795, 796, and 797; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc, without intervening action or debate; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of Bidtah N. Becker, of Arizona, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2022 (New Position); Gretchen Gonzalez Davidson, of Michigan, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2022; Vanessa Northington Gamble, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2026; and David Anthony Hajdu, of New York, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2026?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

### SAFE CONNECTIONS ACT OF 2021

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 193, S. 120.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 120) to prevent and respond to the misuse of communications services that facilitates domestic violence and other crimes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Safe Connections Act of 2021".

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, terms used in this Act that are defined in section 344(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act, have the meanings given those terms in such section 344(a).

#### SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, sexual assault, human trafficking, and related crimes are life-threatening issues and have lasting and harmful effects on individuals, families, and entire communities.

(2) Survivors often lack meaningful support and options when establishing independence from an abuser, including barriers such as financial insecurity and limited access to reliable communications tools to maintain essential connections with family, social safety networks, employers, and support services.

(3) Perpetrators of violence and abuse described in paragraph (1) increasingly use technological and communications tools to exercise control over, monitor, and abuse their victims.

(4) Communications law can play a public interest role in the promotion of safety, life, and property with respect to the types of violence and abuse described in paragraph (1). For example, independent access to a wireless phone plan

can assist survivors in establishing security and autonomy.

(5) Safeguards within communications services can serve a role in preventing abuse and narrowing the digital divide experienced by survivors of abuse.

#### SEC. 4. PROTECTION OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SURVIVORS WITHIN COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES.

Part I of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### "SEC. 344. PROTECTION OF SURVIVORS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, HUMAN TRAFFICKING, AND RELATED CRIMES.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) ABUSER.—The term 'abuser' means an individual who has committed or allegedly committed a covered act against—

"(A) an individual who seeks relief under subsection (b); or

"(B) an individual in the care of an individual who seeks relief under subsection (b).

"(2) COVERED ACT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'covered act' means conduct that constitutes—

"(i) a crime described in section 4002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(a)), including domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sex trafficking;

"(ii) an act or practice described in paragraph (11) or (12) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102) (relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons and sex trafficking, respectively); or

"(iii) an act under State law, Tribal law, or the Uniform Code of Military Justice that is similar to an offense described in clause (i) or (ii).

"(B) CONVICTION NOT REQUIRED.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to require a criminal conviction or any other determination of a court in order for conduct to constitute a covered act.

"(3) COVERED PROVIDER.—The term 'covered provider' means a provider of a private mobile service or commercial mobile service, as those terms are defined in section 332(d).

"(4) PRIMARY ACCOUNT HOLDER.—The term 'primary account holder' means an individual who is a party to a mobile service contract with a covered provider.

"(5) SHARED MOBILE SERVICE CONTRACT.—The term 'shared mobile service contract'—

"(A) means a mobile service contract for an account that includes not less than 2 consumers; and

"(B) does not include enterprise services offered by a covered provider.

"(6) SURVIVOR.—The term 'survivor' means an individual who is not less than 18 years old and—

"(A) against whom a covered act has been committed or allegedly committed; or

"(B) who cares for another individual against whom a covered act has been committed or allegedly committed (provided that the individual providing care did not commit or allegedly commit the covered act).

"(b) SEPARATION OF LINES FROM SHARED MOBILE SERVICE CONTRACT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 business days after receiving a completed line separation request from a survivor pursuant to subsection (c), a covered provider shall, as applicable, with respect to a shared mobile service contract under which the survivor and the abuser each use a line—

"(A) separate the line of the survivor, and the line of any individual in the care of the survivor, from the shared mobile service contract; or

"(B) separate the line of the abuser from the shared mobile service contract.

"(2) LIMITATIONS ON PENALTIES, FEES, AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—A covered provider may not make the separation of a line from a shared